



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,182	02/25/2004	Ming-Fa Wang	SUND 503	3384
23995	7590	12/15/2005	EXAMINER	
RABIN & Berdo, PC 1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20005				TON, ANABEL
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

EV

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/785,182	WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anabel M. Ton	2875	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the detail of the heat dissipating channels 31d is not shown in the drawing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsieh (6,880,947).

2. With regards to applicants limitation of the metallic carrier being “extruded” the applicant is advised that patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Therefore the limitation of “extruded” is not being given any patentable weight because it is a product by process.

Hsieh discloses a metallic carrier(59), wherein the metallic carrier has a top-face (60) and a plurality of heat-dissipating channels(59b) with an accommodation sink being formed on the top-face(metallic carrier forms an accommodation area or “sink” to

accommodate reflecting plate 58); and a light source which is deposited in the accommodation sink(14) (fig 8); the light source comprises a plurality of cold cathode fluorescent lamps (CCFLS) lined up in the accommodation sink(col.2 lines 48-50); a reflector sheet which is deposited in the accommodation sink and is situated under the light source(58); a diffuser plate deposited above the light source(16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4,8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh et al (6,880,947).

Hsieh discloses the claimed invention except for the recitation of the base and lateral bodies of the metallic carrier being fixed on the two ends of carrier's top face by forming a screw joint with the base body. With regards to forming the carrier into one piece from several pieces, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the carrier of Hsieh by several pieces held by a screw means, since it has been held that forming in one piece a structure which has formerly been formed in two, or more pieces, involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 USPQ 164 (1893). Furthermore it appears that the carrier of Hsieh words equally as well being formed in one piece.

- With regards to applicant's recitation that extruded metallic carrier is an aluminum extrusion carrier, as recited above the term "extruded" and in this case "extrusion" has not been given any patentable weight since it is a product by process recitation. Hsieh discloses the heat dissipating carrier/plate as being made of aluminum(col. 2 lines 65-67);
- With regards to applicants term regarding the two lateral bodies as being "deposited" on the two ends of the body's top face in claim 8, the applicant is advised that patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966. Therefore the limitation of "deposited" is not being given any patentable weight because it is a product by process.
- With regards to claim 8, Hiseh discloses the claimed invention except for the recitation of a plurality of second heat dissipating channels being formed on lateral bodies of the carrier. Hsieh discloses an metallic carrier (59) which has a base body and two lateral bodies (fig 8) and a plurality of head dissipating channels formed in the base body and a light source placed in the accommodation sink (14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Hsieh to include a plurality of heat dissipating channels in the lateral bodies/sides of the carrier since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a

device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Furthermore, additional heat dissipating channels along the sides of the carrier would provide the device of Hsieh with a greater amount of means to remove heat from the inner body, which is desirable in backlight applications to prevent heat damage to the inner components of the device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anabel M. Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2382. The examiner can normally be reached on 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandra O'Shea can be reached on (571) 272-2378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Anabel M Ton
Examiner
Art Unit 2875

AMT


Sandra O'Shea
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800